arXiv:1704.06646v1 [quant-ph] 21 Apr 2017

Equilibration time scales in closed many-body quantum systems

Thiago R. de Oliveira[1], Christos Charalambous[2], Daniel Jonathan[1], Maciej Lewenstein[2], and Arnau Riera[2]

[1]Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Av. Gal. Milton Tavares de Souza s/n, Gragoatá, 24210-346, Niterói, RJ, Brazil
[2]ICFO-Institut de Ciencies Fotoniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, 08860 Castelldefels, Barcelona, Spain

April 24, 2017

Abstract

We show that the physical mechanism for the equilibration of closed quantum systems is dephasing, and identify the energy scales that determine the equilibration timescale of a given observable. For realistic physical systems (e.g those with local Hamiltonians), our arguments imply timescales that do not increase with the system size, in contrast to previously known upper bounds. In particular, we show that, for such Hamiltonians, the matrix representation of local observables in the energy basis is banded, and that this property is crucial in order to derive equilibration times that are non-negligible in macroscopic systems. Finally, we give an intuitive interpretation to recent theorems on equilibration time-scales.

1 Introduction

There has recently been renewed interest in the foundations of statistical mechanics from the perspective of quantum theory [1]. One main theme being re-discussed is the derivation of statistical mechanics from the kinematics and dynamics of a closed quantum system. In this approach, instead of assuming *a priori* that the system is in some mixed state, such as e.g. a micro-canonical ensemble, one describes it at all times using a pure state $|\psi(t)\rangle$. One then seeks to show that, under reasonable conditions, the system behaves *as if* it were described by a statistical ensemble. In this way the use of statistical mechanics can be justified without introducing additional external degrees of freedom, such as e.g. thermal 'baths'.

One way such results have been obtained is through (static) typicality arguments: for example, it has been found that 'nearly all' pure states $|\psi\rangle$ appear thermal when one only looks at small

subsystems or at restricted sets of observables [3, 4, 2]. Going further, the equilibration of closed quantum systems has also been addressed from a dynamical approach. It has been shown that, under very general conditions on the Hamiltonian, most initial states equilibrate on average, again when looking at small subsystems or specific observables [3, 5]. It should be mentioned that many results in this direction were already obtained by J. von Neumann in 1929 [6], and that the idea of typicality dates back even to Boltzmann [7].

Most studies of closed-system equilibration fall into one of two broad categories. The first category consists of investigations of particular many-body models (see Secs. 4 and 7.6 in [1] and Secs. 2 and 3 in [8] for a review). Common themes of these works include analyzing the time evolution after a sudden change in some external parameter - a so-called 'quantum quench', how this evolution relates to the integrability of the model, and finally the characteristics of the equilibrium state, for example whether it is the usual *Gibbs state*, or a more general one such as the *Generalised Gibbs Ensemble* (GGE). Most of these models of strongly correlated systems are shown to thermalize because they fulfil the Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis [9], although this is not the only possible mechanism for quantum systems to thermalize. In contrast, integrable models are known to have equilibrium states that are well described by the GGE but not by a standard thermal state.

On the other side there are more mathematically oriented studies that derive general, model-independent theorems about when and in which sense equilibration will occur (see [1] and references therein, in particular [3, 5]). Such general statements usually involve some kind of time averaging: for instance, given some observable A and a system of finite but arbitrarily large size, if its expectation value $\langle A(t)\rangle$ equilibrates, then it must do so around the infinite time average (see Sec. 5.1 of [1])

$$\overline{A} = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \langle A(t)\rangle \ \mathrm{d}t. \tag{1}$$

If the infinite-time average fluctuation of $\langle A(t)\rangle$ around $\bar{A}$ is small, then the system spends most of the time close to equilibrium. In such a case, we say that the observable A equilibrates.

One problem with this approach is that it does not give a time scale for equilibration to occur. A major open question is then to determine what this timescale is, and in particular how it scales with respect to system parameters such as the system size (number of components). Various authors have tackled this question [10, 11], producing upper bounds that imply finite-time equilibration. However, nearly all existing bounds scale with the inverse of the minimum energy difference (gap) in the system's spectrum (see discussion section for details). For physically realistic systems they therefore increase exponentially with the system size, and cannot be a good estimate of the actual equilibration timescale - in particular since equilibration would then not occur in the thermodynamic limit. The only exception we are aware of is a rigorous bound presented in recent work by García-Pintos et al. [10], which seems to be independent of the system size in certain circumstances. However, these circumstances seem to require the overall system state to be highly mixed, and thus are not applicable to a closed system in a pure state.

In this work, we identify the reason for the limitations of current bounds on the equilibration

time, and discuss how to obtain better estimates for the actual timescale. The main issue is that these bounds ultimately rely on the wrong physical mechanism of equilibration. As we comment in detail in the discussion section, they require a time long enough such that each separate Fourier component of the variance of $\langle A(t)\rangle$ averages out, and as a consequence vastly overestimate the time scale at which equilibration occurs. In contrast, we prove here that the correct mechanism of equilibration is in fact *dephasing* between different Fourier components - a point that was also briefly made in a classic reference [12], but that has apparently not been fully appreciated by the current community. This point of view is also followed in the complementary Ref. [13] which also addresses the problem of estimating the equilibration times in a closed quantum system.

From this mechanism it is possible to heuristically estimate a timescale which, under reasonable circumstances, does not depend on the system size, and which thus seems to capture the relevant physics. Although our argument does not result in a rigorous bound such as those in Refs. [10, 11], we are able to discuss how this timescale depends on the physical properties of the system. We find that the coherences of the observables of interest in the energy basis, $\langle E_i|A|E_j\rangle$, play a fundamental role: in order to attain a finite equilibration time, these coherences must become small as $E_i - E_j$ increases. Importantly, we find that the size of the system only plays a role in the typical size of the fluctuations, but not in the time of equilibration. In other words, small systems fail to equilibrate not because their equilibration time is large, but because their fluctuations are big; equilibration is thus actually not possible for small systems. We illustrate these results with numerical simulations of spins chains.

2 General setting and definition of the problem

Let us consider a closed system whose state is described by a vector in a Hilbert space of dimension d_T and whose Hamiltonian has a spectral representation

$$H = \sum_{k=1}^{d_E} E_k P_k \,, \tag{2}$$

where E_k are its energies and P_k the projectors onto its eigenspaces. Note that the sum runs over $d_E \leq d_T$ terms, since some eigenspaces can be degenerate.

We denote the initial state by $|\psi(0)\rangle$. If the Hamiltonian has degenerate energies, we choose an eigenbasis of H such that $|\psi(0)\rangle$ has non-zero overlap with only one eigenstate $|E_k\rangle$ for each distinct energy. Choosing units such that $\hbar = 1$, the state at time t is then given by

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_k c_k e^{-iE_k t}|E_k\rangle, \tag{3}$$

with $c_k \equiv \langle E_k|\psi(0)\rangle$. It is clear that $|\psi(t)\rangle$ evolves in the subspace spanned by $\{|E_k\rangle\}$ as if it were acted on by the non-degenerate Hamiltonian $H' = \sum_k E_k|E_k\rangle\langle E_k|$. In this case, if the system

equilibrates, the equilibrium state must be

$$\omega = \sum_k |c_k|^2 |E_k\rangle\langle E_k| \,. \tag{4}$$

In this article, following a number of authors, [3, 5, 11, 10] we will study equilibration by focusing on observables. The idea is that a system can be considered in equilibrium if all experimentally relevant (typically, coarse-grained) observables A have equilibrated. In other words, we will focus on understanding how the expectation value $\langle A(t)\rangle$ approaches its equilibrium value $\mathrm{Tr}(A\omega)$. Note that, in order to even talk about equilibration time scales, we must assume that such a condition holds, i. e., that this observable sooner or later equilibrates.

Let us introduce the *time signal* of A, given the initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle$, as the distance of $\langle A(t)\rangle$ from equilibrium at time t

$$g(t) \coloneqq \frac{1}{\Delta_A} \left(\langle\psi(t)|A|\psi(t)\rangle - \mathrm{Tr}(A\omega)\right) \tag{5}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Delta_A} \sum_{i\neq j} (c_j^* A_{ji} c_i)\, \mathrm{e}^{-\,\mathrm{i}(E_i - E_j)t} \,, \tag{6}$$

where $A_{ij} \coloneqq \langle E_i|A|E_j\rangle$ are the matrix elements of A in the energy eigenbasis, and $\Delta_A = a_{\max} - a_{\min}$ is the range of possible outcomes, being $a_{\max(\min)}$ the largest (smallest) eigenvalue of A. The denominator Δ_A is introduced to make the time signal dimensionless and satisfying $|g(t)| \leq 1$. Note that the time signals of two observables A and $A' = b(A - a_0)$ are identical for $a_0, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

We can conveniently rewrite the time signal as

$$g(t) = \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{G}} v_\alpha\, \mathrm{e}^{-\,\mathrm{i}\,G_\alpha t}, \tag{7}$$

where $\alpha \in \mathcal{G} = \{(i,j) : i,j \in \{1,\dots d_E\}, i \neq j\}$ labels each energy gap $G_\alpha = E_i - E_j$ appearing in the system's spectrum, and where

$$v_\alpha = v_{(i,j)} = \frac{c_j^* A_{ji} c_i}{\Delta_A}. \tag{8}$$

We will refer to the complex number v_α as the *amplitude* of the corresponding gap G_α, and to its normalized square modulus $q_\alpha \coloneqq |v_\alpha|^2 / \sum_\beta |v_\beta|^2$ as the *relevance* of G_α. Note that the set of relevances form a probability distribution over $\mathcal{G}$.

A physical interpretation of this normalization factor can be given as follows [3, 5, 14]: note that, if the system has *non-degenerate gaps*, then

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathrm{d}t |g(t)|^2 = \sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2. \tag{9}$$

In other words, this quantity gives the infinite time average of (the square of) the deviation of $\langle A(t)\rangle$ from its equilibrium value. We consider that the observable A equilibrates if this quantity is small, in the sense that

$$\left\langle |g|^2 \right\rangle_\infty := \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \mathrm{d}t |g(t)|^2 \lesssim (\frac{\delta A}{\Delta_A})^2 \,, \tag{10}$$

where δA is the experimentally available resolution. Furthermore, note that $\Delta_A/\delta A$ quantifies the the amount of different possible outcomes of a measurement and hence $\delta A/\Delta_A$ is expected to be much much smaller than 1.

In Refs. [3, 5, 14], sufficient conditions for equilibration in the sense defined above are given by bounding the average distance from equilibrium (9). In particular, in [14] it is shown that for any Hamiltonian with non-degenerate gaps,

$$\sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2 \leq \frac{1}{d_{\text{eff}}}, \tag{11}$$

where the effective dimension is defined as $d_{\text{eff}} := 1/(\sum_k |c_k|^4) = 1/\mathrm{Tr}(\omega^2)$, which roughly speaking tells us how many eigenstates of the Hamiltonian participate in the superposition of the initial state. Thus, a large effective dimension, which is usually the case in many body systems (see Appendix C and Ref. [15]), is sufficient to guarantee that condition (10) will be satisfied. Concerning the assumption of the Hamiltonian having non-degenerate gaps, it is shown in [11] that as long as there are not exponentially many degeneracies the argument stays the same.

3 Equilibration as dephasing

Let us consider a situation in which the initial state is out of equilibrium, i. e. the time signal of a given operator is initially significantly larger than the equilibrium value: $|g(0)| \gg \sqrt{\langle |g|^2\rangle_\infty}$. Our first observation is that, in order for this to happen, the *phases of the complex numbers v_α in the time signal* (7) *need to be highly synchronized*. To see this, it is useful to think of the v_α's as points in the complex plane.

Result 1 (Equilibration is dephasing)**.** *Given a time signal $g(t) = \sum_\alpha v_\alpha \,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,G_\alpha t}$ with $v_\alpha = |v_\alpha|\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\theta_\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}$ being the initial amplitude of the gap $G_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, a necessary condition for the system to be initially out of equilibrium, i.e., $|g(0)|$ significantly larger than the typical equilibrium fluctuation $\sqrt{\langle |g|^2\rangle_\infty}$, is that the initial phases θ_α are significantly synchronized. More precisely, we quantify the distance from equilibrium as*

$$|g(0)|^2 - \left\langle |g|^2 \right\rangle_\infty = 2\sum_{\alpha<\beta} |v_\alpha||v_\beta| \cos(\theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta)\,, \tag{12}$$

which becomes negligible when the phases θ_α are isotropically distributed.



Figure 1: *Left:* Function $|g(t)|^2$at time $t = 0$ when the system is quenched i.e. out of equilibrium. In our framework this implies that the points on the complex plane representing the terms appearing in the sum reprsentation of $g(t)$ should be close together. *Right:* Function $|g(t)|^2$at some time t' after equilibration has occured. In our framework this implies that the points on the complex plane should be relatively spread out on the plane.

Proof. Equation (12) follows from a straight forward calculation

$$|g(0)|^2 = \left(\sum_\alpha v_\alpha\right)\left(\sum_\beta v_\beta\right)^* = \left\langle |g|^2 \right\rangle_\infty + 2\sum_{\alpha<\beta} |v_\alpha||v_\beta| \cos(\theta_\alpha - \theta_\beta)\,. \tag{13}$$

To see that isotropic randomly distributed phases give $|g(0)|^2 \simeq \left\langle |g|^2 \right\rangle_\infty$, let $v_\alpha = |v_\alpha|\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\theta_\alpha}$ be a set of independent random complex variables with an isotropic probability distribution $p_\alpha(r,\theta) = p_\alpha(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\delta(r - r_\alpha)$, i. e. the random variable v_α has fixed modulus r_α and a random phase θ_α uniformly distributed around the circle. Then, the variance of the random variable $\sum_\alpha v_\alpha$ is

$$\mathrm{var}\left(\sum_\alpha v_\alpha\right) = \sum_\alpha \mathrm{var}(v_\alpha) = \sum_\alpha \left\langle |v_\alpha|^2 \right\rangle = \sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2 \tag{14}$$

where we have used the fact that the variance of a sum of independent random variables is the sum of variances and the first moments $< v_\alpha >= 0$. That is, if the phases of v_α are uniformly distributed, then the typical initial value of the time signal is $|g(0)| = |\sum_\alpha v_\alpha| \simeq \left(\sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2\right)^{1/2}$. □

Suppose, on the other hand, that the amplitudes v_α are more or less aligned in the complex plane so that $|g(0)|^2 \gg \left\langle |g|^2 \right\rangle_\infty$ (see Fig. 1 left). When time runs, each number $v_\alpha\,\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\,G_\alpha t}$ rotates with angular velocity G_α. The dispersion in the distribution of the gaps G_α implies that it is a matter of time before the phases $G_\alpha t$ become desynchronized, spreading and forming an isotropic

cloud centered at the origin of the complex plane as shown in Fig. 1 (right). When this happens, the value of $g(t)$ remains nearly constant for long times, and we say the system has reached equilibrium with respect to the observable A.

This mechanism for equilibration is usually called *dephasing* and has been introduced several times in the literature in different fields. It has been used, for instance, in the decay theory of unstable systems, where one studies the decay of the fidelity $|\langle\psi(0)|\psi(t)\rangle|^2$ and is interested in deviations from an exponential decay for small and large times [16]. The study of fidelity has also reappeared recently in the context of quantum quenches; see [17] and references therein. Another paradigmatic example is the study of the collapse and revival of wave packets [18] or of the Rabi oscillation in two level systems coupled to a radiation field [19, 20].

Let us introduce now a heuristic argument to determine the equilibration time-scales. To estimate the dephasing time, let us consider that all phases are initially the same. One way to lower bound the time needed for the phases to spread around the whole range $[0, 2\pi)$ is to use the time it takes for the difference between the fastest and slowest phase to differ by 2π: $tG_{\max} - tG_{\min} = 2\pi$ which leads to $T_{dep} \sim 2\pi/(G_{\max} - G_{\min})$. However, the slowest and fastest gaps are not necessarily very relevant, that is, they can have a relatively small amplitude v_α in Eq. (7). For this reason, a better estimate is the gap dispersion σ_G, which we define as the standard deviation of the G_α when weighted by their relevance q_α, i. e.

$$\sigma_G^2 := \sum_\alpha q_\alpha (G_\alpha - \mu_G)^2. \tag{15}$$

Here in fact the average gap $\mu_G = 0$, since for each gap $G_{(i,j)} = E_i - E_j$ there is also $G_{(j,i)} = E_j - E_i = -G_{(i,j)}$, and also $|v_{(i,j)}| = |v_{(j,i)}|$. By the argumentation made above, we expect that, at least in cases where the distribution G_α is of a unimodal type, the equilibration time can be estimated by $2\pi/\sigma_G$. In the next section we will give more detailed arguments in favour of this claim.

Let us also argue heuristically which physical properties determine the value of σ_G and so the equilibration time $T_{\text{eq}} \sim 2\pi/\sigma_G$ estimated by it. The dispersion σ_G depends on the probabilities q_α, which in turn are proportional to the $|v_\alpha|^2$. As $v_\alpha := c_i^* c_j \langle E_i|A|E_j\rangle$ one can see that the variance σ_G is determined by: i) the distributions of the coefficients $|c_i|^2$, ii) the matrix-elements of the observable in the energy basis $\langle E_i|A|E_j\rangle$, and iii) the distribution of the values of the gaps $G_\alpha = E_i - E_j$ themselves.

The fact that a system equilibrates should not depend on the details of the initial state and, in particular, it should equilibrate for initial states that have a uniform energy distribution within the relevant energy subspace, e.g. generic states (sampled randomly from the relevant energy subspace). We also know that the variance of the gaps G itself usually increases with $\sqrt{n}$ being n the system size (since the variance of the density of states increases with $\sqrt{n}$), what would make σ_G increase with $\sqrt{n}$ and therefore T_{eq} to shrink with $\sqrt{n}$. To avoid a T_{eq} to vanish in the thermodynamic limit, we need the distribution $v_{(i,j)} = c_i c_j^* \langle E_j|A|E_i\rangle$ to have a fixed variance as n increases (to kill the increase in the variance of the G). Thus, the distribution $\langle E_j|A|E_i\rangle$ should have a fixed variance. One way for this to happen is that the values of $\langle E_j|A|E_i\rangle$ decrease (or

become null) for large values of $E_j - E_i$. Therefore, for most initial states, this is a necessary property for observables which equilibrates in a finite time.

The above intuition that some relevant time scale is estimated by the inverse of a frequency dispersion of the type (15) appears also in the literature for some particular problems and models. For instance, in [20], the authors considered a two-level system (e.g. an atom or a spin) interacting with a quantized radiation field of photons. They study the Rabi oscillations of the two-level system, which is also a sum of terms that depend on the Rabi frequencies for different number of photons and different states of the two-level system. In this work they showed that the range of Rabi frequencies that have a significant contribution to this sum, determines the collapse time. Similarly, dephasing is the basic mechanism of decay of coherence in the presence of the inhomogeneous broadening [21].

Finally, a relevant scenario where one is also interested in relaxation times is the decay of quasiparticles in interacting many-body systems. In such case, the life-time of a quasiparticle can be estimated from the width of the peak of the spectral function corresponding to such quasiparticle. In particular, in the Fermi liquid theory, dephasing is the mechanism responsible for the finite lifetime of quasi-particles [22, 23].

4 Fourier description of the dephasing framework

In this section we give further substance to the above heuristic argument to estimate the equilibration time-scale by means of Fourier transform techniques.

Let us first give a general idea of our approach. Suppose the time-signal $g(t)$ decayed more or less steadily to zero, and stayed there. If so, then, an good estimate for the equilibration time scale would be given by the time variance

$$\Delta t^2 \coloneqq \frac{1}{\|g\|_2} \int \mathrm{d}t |g(t)|^2 (t - \mu_t)^2 \tag{16}$$

with $\mu_t \coloneqq \int \mathrm{d}t |g(t)|^2 t / \|g\|_2$ (see Fig. 2).

In such a case, following the spirit of our previous heuristic example, it would also be tempting to estimate the order of magnitude of Δt by taking the inverse of the spectral variance $\Delta\omega$ of the signal. Indeed, this can be justified if we recall the standard uncertainty principle of Fourier analysis [24]

$$\Delta t \cdot \Delta\omega \geq 1/2 \tag{17}$$

and furthermore assume that the signal spectrum is close to saturating this inequality (which occurs exactly only for Gaussian spectra, but is approximately true when the spectrum is unimodal and without long tails).

However, for finite systems, our initial assumption of steady decay does not apply. The time signal has recurrences, that is, a long time after the dephasing has occured and the system has equilibrated, the phases get again aligned (synchronized) in the complex plane, and the signal regains strength (Fig. 2). In order to avoid this problem, in this section we introduce a coarse-grained



Figure 2: Example of a time signal which has a recurrence time. In absence of recurrences, the equilibration time scale would be given by Δt defined in Eq. (16).

version of the signal spectrum, which dampens out the recurrences. This allows us to exploit the uncertainty principle to estimate the equilibration time-scales, as described above. Under some mild conditions, we show that the equilibration time-scale estimated provided by this procedure coincides with the one previously given by the heuristic argument of points dephasing in the complex plane.

4.1 The frequency signal

We define the *frequency signal*, $\tilde{g}(\omega)$, as the Fourier transform of the time signal $g(t)$

$$\tilde{g}(\omega) \coloneqq \mathcal{F}[g](\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(t) e^{-i\omega t} dt \,. \tag{18}$$

which roughly speaking tells us the relevance with which every frequency contributes to the time signal. When both the time and frequency signals are square-integrable ($g, \tilde{g} \in L^2$), the standard uncertainty principle of Eq. (17) applies, where

$$\Delta\omega^2 \coloneqq \frac{1}{\|\tilde{g}\|_2} \int \mathrm{d}\omega |\tilde{g}(\omega)|^2 (\omega - \mu_\omega)^2 \tag{19}$$

with $\mu_\omega \coloneqq \int \mathrm{d}\omega |\tilde{g}(\omega)|^2 \omega / \|\tilde{g}\|_2$.

However, in the case of time signals such as in Eq. (7), $g(t) \notin L^2$, as can be seen from Eq. (9) (the integral diverges proportional to T). The same is true for the frequency signal, since

$$\tilde{g}(\omega) = \mathcal{F}[g](\omega) = \sum_\alpha v_\alpha \delta(\omega - G_\alpha) \tag{20}$$

where $\delta(x)$ is the Dirac delta distribution. Hence, the uncertainty principle in Eq. (17) cannot be directly applied.

It is worth noting here that, due to the finite range of energies present in our system, there is an asymmetry between the uncertainties in time and frequency of the signal $g(t)$. On the one hand, the uncertainty in frequency can still be well-defined. To see how, recall first that, for $g(t) \in L^2$, it is possible to write the moments of a frequency signal in terms of the corresponding time signal and its derivatives, e.g.

$$\left\langle \omega^2 \right\rangle = -\frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g^*(t) g''(t) dt}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(t)|^2 dt} \tag{21}$$

In our case, although each of these integrals diverges, their ratio does have a well-defined limit, in the sense that

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} -\frac{\int_{-T}^{T} g^*(t) g''(t) dt}{\int_{-T}^{T} |g(t)|^2 dt} = \frac{\sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2 G_\alpha^2}{\sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2}. \tag{22}$$

Taking then this limit as the appropriate definition of $\left\langle \omega^2 \right\rangle$ in this case, and noting that, in the same sense, $\langle \omega \rangle = 0$, we obtain that $\Delta\omega = \sqrt{\langle \omega^2 \rangle}$ is indeed precisely equal to the gap dispersion σ_G defined in Eq. (15).

On the other hand, though, the value of Δt diverges, even when taking limits in the same sense above. This can be understood physically due to the previously mentioned recurrences in the time signal. Indeed, $g(t)$ is a quasiperiodic function that experiences, over an infinitely large time interval, an infinite number of recurrences to a value arbitrary close to its initial one [25, 26].

4.2 The coarse-grained signal

We now define the notion of *coarse-graining*, in which we introduce a microscopic energy scale ϵ below which the fine-grained details of the spectrum are washed out. As we show below, this is done by replacing the discrete spectrum present in Eq. (20) by a suitable smooth version.

As previously mentioned, such coarse graining of the frequency signal dampens the time signal $g(t)$, removing the recurrences seen in Fig. 2 and making $g(t)$ and $\tilde{g}(\omega)$ belong to L^2. We shall see later that it will also allow us to exploit certain existing statements concerning the shapes of *energy densities* and *density of states* of realistic initial states and short-ranged local Hamiltonians [27], which will justify our assumption of quasi-saturating the uncertainty bound.

An important issue in the coarse-graining is obviously the choice of the energy scale ϵ. This will be discussed later in detail but we can already understand that in order to remove the recurrences, the discreteness of the frequency signal has to be removed, which implies an ϵ much larger than the separation between consecutive gaps.

Mathematically, the coarse-graining is accomplished by convolving the frequency signal with an appropriate *window function* $h_\epsilon(x)$, which is only nonzero over an interval of size $O(\epsilon)$. In our case, we find it convenient to choose $h_\epsilon(x) = CN_\epsilon(x)$, where

$$N_\sigma(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2}} \tag{23}$$

is the normalized Gaussian distribution centred at the origin and with standard deviation σ, and C a constant that is determined below.

With this spirit, the ϵ-coarse-grained version of the frequency signal is defined as

$$\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) \coloneqq (h_\epsilon * \tilde{g})(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\omega' h_\epsilon(\omega' - \omega)\tilde{g}(\omega') \,. \tag{24}$$

If $\tilde{g}(\omega)$ is given by Eq. (20), then the $\epsilon-$coarse-grained frequency signal is

$$\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) = \sum_\alpha v_\alpha \, h_\epsilon(\omega - G_\alpha) \,. \tag{25}$$

In other words, coarse-graining corresponds to widening each Dirac-δ in the original spectral function into a Gaussian of $O(\epsilon)$ width. Note that, in doing this, we remove fine details of the spectrum such as the *level statistics*. Furthermore, unlike $\tilde{g}(\omega)$, $\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)$ is square integrable and lies in L^2 :

$$\int \mathrm{d}\omega |\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} v_\alpha v_\beta^* \, (h_\epsilon * h_\epsilon)(G_\alpha - G_\beta) = C^2 \sum_{\alpha,\beta} v_\alpha v_\beta^* \, N_{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}\,(G_\alpha - G_\beta) < \infty, \tag{26}$$

where we have used the fact that $(h_\epsilon * h_\epsilon)(x) = C^2 N_{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}(x)$.

A coarse-grained frequency signal defines a coarse-grained time signal given by

$$g_\epsilon(t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\tilde{g}_\epsilon](t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[h_\epsilon](t) \cdot g(t) = \frac{C}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 t^2} \, g(t) \,, \tag{27}$$

where we have used the convolution theorem for Fourier transforms. The constant C is fixed by imposing that the time signal is not affected by coarse-graining the frequency signal in time scales $t \ll \epsilon^{-1}$ i. e. $g_\epsilon(0) = g(0)$. This leads to $C = \sqrt{2\pi}$ and

$$h_\epsilon(\omega) = \sqrt{2\pi} N_\epsilon(\omega) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\omega^2}{2\epsilon^2}} , \tag{28}$$

$$g_\epsilon(t) = \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^2 t^2} \, g(t) \,. \tag{29}$$

Even if the time signal $g(t)$ equilibrates after some time, we know that it must eventually have recurrences. To determine the equilibration time-scale from $g_\epsilon(t)$, we need that ϵ^{-1} is much greater than the equilibration timescale, but much smaller than the recurrence timescale. In this way, we ensure that the coarse-grained time signal will be indistinguishable from the original one during the equilibration process, but unlike the latter will then decay to zero.

4.3 The coarse-grained density of relevant gaps

We now focus on the properties of the variance of gap values with respect to the coarse-grained frequency signal $\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)$, i. e.

$$\Delta\omega_\epsilon^2 \coloneqq \frac{1}{\|\tilde{g}_\epsilon\|_2} \int \mathrm{d}\omega |\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 (\omega - \tilde{\mu}_\omega)^2 \tag{30}$$



Figure 3: (color online). Example of the coarse-graining of a sum of Dirac-delta distributions (black arrows) with a Gaussian distribution (red) whose standard deviation is of the same order of magnitude as the separation between the delta's. The coarse-grained signal is represented in blue.

with $\tilde{\mu}_\omega := \int \mathrm{d}\omega |\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 \omega / \|\tilde{g}_\epsilon\|_2$. We will refer to $\Delta\omega_\epsilon$ as the 'dispersion of relevant gaps', and to the weight

$$|\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} v_\alpha v_\beta^* h_\epsilon(\omega - G_\alpha) h_\epsilon(\omega - G_\beta) \tag{31}$$

as the *density of relevant gaps*.

Our goal is to show that, under a wide range of choices of ϵ and of physically relevant circumstances: i) $\Delta\omega_\epsilon^2$ is very close to the gap dispersion σ_G^2 of the original signal, as defined in Eq. (15), and at the same time (ii) the inverse $\Delta\omega_\epsilon^{-1}$ is a good estimate for the equilibration time.

Note first that, by construction, for every gap $G_\alpha = E_i - E_j$ in Eq. (7) (and, by extension, Eq. (25), its negative $G_{\bar{\alpha}} := E_j - E_i$ also appears, with $|v_{\bar{\alpha}}| = |v_\alpha|$. Hence the 'average gap' $\tilde{\mu}_\omega$ vanishes for any ϵ and the variance $\Delta\omega^2$ is equivalent to $\langle\omega^2\rangle$, ie:

$$\Delta\omega_\epsilon^2 = \frac{\int \omega^2 |\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 d\omega}{\int |\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 d\omega} \tag{32}$$

After some straightforward manipulation, using Eqs. (28) and (31), we obtain

$$\Delta\omega_\epsilon^2 = \frac{\sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2 \left(G_\alpha^2 + \epsilon^2/2\right) + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} v_\alpha v_\beta^* \left[(G_\alpha + G_\beta)^2 + 2\epsilon^2\right] e^{-\frac{(G_\alpha - G_\beta)^2}{4\epsilon^2}}}{\sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2 + \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} v_\alpha v_\beta^* \, e^{-\frac{(G_\alpha - G_\beta)^2}{4\epsilon^2}}} \tag{33}$$

It can be easily checked that, if $\epsilon \to 0$, this expression indeed reduces to Eq. (15). More specifically, $\Delta\omega_\epsilon^2$ will be very close to σ_G^2 for all $\epsilon \ll \min(G_\alpha - G_\beta)$. Indeed, in this limit the Gaussian window function $h_\epsilon(\omega)$ becomes negligibly thin with respect to the smallest separation between gaps, and the coarse-grained spectrum $\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)$ resembles the original discrete spectrum $g(\omega)$. Precisely for this reason, however, this limit is of little use to our goals. Another way

of putting this is that, for such small values of ϵ the coarse-grained time signal (Eq. (29)) does not have time to decay before the recurrence timescale of the original signal, which is of order $\min(G_\alpha - G_\beta)^{-1}$.

To make further progress at this point, it is necessary to assume some features about the amplitudes v_α. Otherwise, a fine tuning between phases and modulus of v_α can make $|\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|$ have an arbitrary behaviour, preventing any general statement concerning the equilibration of $g_\epsilon(t)$.

Inspired by [15], we will adopt a weak-typicality point of view: let us assume that the overall pure state $|\psi\rangle$ whose evolution we are considering is drawn from an ensemble for which the v_α's are describable by some *smooth functions plus stochastic fluctuations*. Note that we do not assume a uniform ensemble over all states, as is the case in most typicality studies, merely one for which the resulting distribution over the v_α's has some very general features which are described below. In the spirit of statistical physics, we basically replace complexity by apparent randomness.

In the following we show that the process of coarse-graining removes the fluctuations and makes the density of relevant gaps $|\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2$ have a smooth behaviour.

Result 2 (Coarse-grained frequency signal)**.** *Let us consider the amplitudes v_α of the gaps G_α to be described by*

$$v_\alpha = v(G_\alpha) + \delta v_\alpha \tag{34}$$

where $v(\omega) = r(\omega)\,\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\,\theta(\omega)}$, with $r(\omega)$ and $\theta(\omega)$ two functions with a Lipshitz constant upper bounded by some $K \ll \epsilon^{-1}$, and where δv_α are independent random variables that average to zero $< \delta v_\alpha >= 0$ and $< \delta v_\alpha \delta v_\beta >= \gamma^2(G_\alpha)\delta_{\alpha\beta}$. The variance $\gamma^2(\omega)$ is a function that represents the strength of the fluctuations and also has a Lipshitz constant upper bounded by K. Then, with a high probability $\mathrm{erf}(m) \geq 1 - \exp(-m^2)$, the density of relevant gaps fulfils the following bound

$$|\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) - 2\pi v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)| \leq \rho_\epsilon(\omega)\left(c_1 K\epsilon + \pi^{1/4} m \frac{\gamma(\omega)}{\sqrt{\epsilon\rho_\epsilon(\omega)}}\right). \tag{35}$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant, $\rho_\epsilon(\omega) = (\rho * N_\epsilon)(\omega)$ is the coarse-grained density of gaps*, with $\rho(\omega) = \sum_\alpha \delta(\omega - G_\alpha)$ being the density of gaps. The coarse-grained density of gaps $\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$ describes how many gaps are ϵ close to the frequency ω.*

That is, the process of coarse-graining washes out the fluctuations δv_α turning the coarse-grained frequency signal into a smooth function

$$\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) \simeq 2\pi v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega), \tag{36}$$

where the meaning of the approximation is made precise in Eq. (35)*.*

The proof is tedious and non-illuminating so we give it in the Appendix A.

Note that the error in (35) has two components. The term $K\epsilon$ is due to the variation of the "smooth" functions with Lipshitz constant smaller than K within an interval of width $O(\epsilon)$. The second component $\gamma(\omega)/\sqrt{\epsilon\rho_\epsilon(\omega)}$ is the flucutation that shrinks according to the central limit theorem with $\sqrt{\epsilon\rho_\epsilon(\omega)}$, where $\epsilon\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$ is the number of gaps G_α within an interval $O(\epsilon)$.

In order for Eq. (35) to be meaningful and the error bound small, an optimization over ϵ is needed. It is easy to see that the error is small as long as the parameter ϵ is much larger than the spacing between consecutive gaps and much smaller than the inverse of the Lipshitz constants of the continuous functions $v(\omega)$ and $\gamma(\omega)$, i. e.

$$G_{\alpha+1} - G_\alpha \ll \epsilon \ll K^{-1} \,. \tag{37}$$

For many-body systems, as the energy differences between consecutive gaps shrink exponentially to zero in the system size, ϵ can be also taken exponentially to zero. This makes the time signal and its coarse-grained version indistinguishable in any realistic time-scale.

In sum, if the gap relevances v_α can be described by a continuous part plus a fluctuating part, as in Eq. (34), then the coarse-grained density of relevant gaps is a smooth function given by

$$|\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 \simeq 4\pi^2 |v(\omega)|^2 \rho_\epsilon(\omega)^2 \,. \tag{38}$$

This will be particularly useful in the following section, where we apply these ideas in the case of many body systems described by short-ranged Hamiltonians.

5 Relevant energy scales and equilibration time scales for local Hamiltonians

In this section, we focus on the particular but relevant case of short-range Hamiltonians and initial states that have a finite correlation length. For such systems, we express the density of relevant gaps in terms of the energy density of the initial state and the function that describes the matrix-elements of the observable. By doing so, we identify the energy scales that determine the dispersion of gaps. We find that there are mainly two relevant energy scales: the energy fluctuations of the initial state and the bandwidth of the matrix of the observable A in the Hamiltonian eigenbasis. In the case of systems globally out of equilibrium, only those observables that are banded in the Hamiltonian basis can be observed out of equilibrium for a non-negligible time.

Local Hamiltonian. Let us define a *short-ranged* or *local* Hamiltonian of a spin lattice system, i.e., acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{x\in V} \mathcal{H}_x$ with $\dim(\mathcal{H}_x) = d$, as

$$H = \sum_{u\in\mathcal{E}} h_u \tag{39}$$

where the locality structure is given by a graph $(V, \mathcal{E})$ with a vertex set V and edge set $\mathcal{E}$. The number of terms of the Hamiltonian is denoted by $n = |\mathcal{E}|$. We consider systems for which it is possible to define a sequence of Hamiltonians H_n of different sizes. This becomes trivial in the case of translational invariant systems and regular lattices, but also includes systems with disorder, and defects. The reason for introducing such a sequence of Hamiltonians H_n is that it allows us to

define the thermodynamic limit. For simplicity, the subindex n is not explicitly written from now on.

Energy density of the initial state. The *energy density* $f(E)$ of an initial state $|\psi(0)\rangle = \sum_i c_i |E_i\rangle$ is defined by

$$f(E) := \sum_{i=1}^{d_E} |c_i|^2 \delta(E - E_i)\,, \tag{40}$$

and, what is more relevant for us, its coarse-grained version reads $f_\epsilon(E) := (N_\epsilon * f)(E)$.

For the case of local Hamiltonians, the coarse-grained energy density of states with a finite correlation length has been proven to be Gaussian (Lemma 8 in Ref. [27])

$$f_\epsilon(E) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_E}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(E-\mu_E)^2}{2\sigma_E}} \tag{41}$$

with standard deviation $\sigma_E^2 = \langle\psi(0)|(H-\mu_E)^2|\psi(0)\rangle$ and mean $\mu_E = \langle\psi(0)|H|\psi(0)\rangle$. Initial states that are globally out of equilibrium, e. g. globally quenched, have energy densities with mean and standard deviation that scale in the system size as $\sigma_E \propto \sqrt{n}$ and $\mu_E \propto n$.

If the system is at criticality and the correlations decay in a power law, this Gaussian shape cannot be guaranteed anymore. Anyway, the energy fluctuations can still scale as $\sigma_E \propto \sqrt{n}$ as long as the power m of the decay is sufficiently fast, i. e. $m > D+1$ where D is the spatial dimension of the lattice (see Appendix C for details).

Matrix-elements of an observable in the energy basis. In the spirit of previous section, we constrain ourselves to observables with off-diagonal matrix-elements in the Hamiltonian basis that can be described by a "continuous" function $S(E,\omega)$ plus some fluctuations δA_{ij}

$$|A_{ij}|^2 = S\left(\frac{E_i+E_j}{2}, \frac{E_i-E_j}{2}\right) + \delta A_{ij}\,, \tag{42}$$

where this choice of writing the arguments of the function $S(E,\omega)$ will be shown to be convenient in the following section. As in the previous section, the Lipshitz constant of $S(E,\omega)$ is assumed to be bounded by K.

Note that the so called Eigenstate Thermalization Hypothesis (ETH) can be seen as a particular case of this assumption (42). The ETH is an ansatz on the matrix-elements of an observable A in the Hamiltonian eigenbasis,

$$A_{ij} = \langle E_i|A|E_j\rangle = \mathcal{A}(E)\delta_{ij} + \rho(E)^{-1} f_{\text{ETH}}(E,\omega) R_{ij} \tag{43}$$

where $E = (E_i+E_j)/2$ and $\omega = (E_i - E_j)/2$. The functions $\mathcal{A}$ and $f_{\text{ETH}}(E,\omega)$ are smooth functions of their arguments, and R_{ij} are complex numbers randomly distributed, each with zero mean and unit variance. The essential idea is that both in (42) and (43) the matrix-elements of the observable can be described by a smooth function.

Note that in our case, in contrast to ETH, we do not assume anything about the diagonal elements of the observable in the energy basis. This is due to the fact that we are not concerned about what is the equilibrium state of the system (whether is thermal or not), but only about how long the relaxation process takes.

Once the energy density $f_\epsilon(E)$ and the function $S(E,\omega)$ that describes the observable are introduced, we are now ready to express the density of relevant gaps in terms of these functions:

Result 3 (Density of relevant gaps)**.** *Given a Hamiltonian, an initial state with populations $|c_i|^2$ and an observable such that the matrix-elements in the Hamiltonian eigenbasis $|A_{ij}|^2$ can be described by means of the smooth function $S(E,\omega)$ plus some fluctuations as in Eq.* (42)*. Then, up to errors $O(\epsilon K)$, the density of relevant gaps can be written as*

$$|g_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 = 2\pi\rho_\epsilon(\omega) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE f_\epsilon(E-\omega/2) f_\epsilon(E+\omega/2) S(E,\omega)\,. \tag{44}$$

Furthermore, if the Hamiltonian is local and the initial state has a finite correlation length, such that the coarse-grained energy density $f_\epsilon(E)$ is the Gaussian (41)*, then*

$$|g_\epsilon(\omega)|^2 = 2\pi\, N_{\sqrt{2}\sigma_E}(\omega)\, S(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)\,, \tag{45}$$

where the function $S(\omega)$ is defined as

$$S(\omega) \coloneqq \int dE\, N_{\frac{\sigma_E}{\sqrt{2}}}(E-\mu_E) S(E,\omega)\,, \tag{46}$$

with μ_E and σ_E the mean and standard deviation of the energy density.

Proof. Let us introduce the density

$$R_\epsilon(\omega) \coloneqq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}E\, f_\epsilon(E-\omega/2) f_\epsilon(E+\omega/2) S(E,\omega) \tag{47}$$

and plug in it the energy density $f_\epsilon(E) \coloneqq \sum_{i=1}^{d_E} |c_i|^2 N_\epsilon(E-E_i)$. A straight forward calculation leads to

$$R_\epsilon(\omega) = \sum_{i,j} N_{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}\left(\omega-(E_i-E_j)\right)|c_i|^2|c_j|^2 \int \mathrm{d}E\, S(E,\omega) N_{\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}}\left(E-\frac{E_i+E_j}{2}\right)\,, \tag{48}$$

where we have used that $N_\epsilon(E+\omega-E_i)N_\epsilon(E-\omega-E_j) = N_{\frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}}\left(E-\frac{E_i+E_j}{2}\right) N_{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}\left(\omega-(E_i-E_j)\right)$. By considering that $S(E,\omega)$ is the smooth description of the matrix elements $|A_{ij}|^2$, we get, up to errors ϵK,

$$R_\epsilon(\omega) = \sum_\alpha |v_\alpha|^2 N_{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}(\omega-G_\alpha) = |v(\omega)|^2 \rho_{\sqrt{2}\epsilon}(\omega)\,. \tag{49}$$

Putting Eqs. (47) and (49) together with Result 3 implies (44).

Now for initial states with a Gaussian energy density as in Eq. (41), simple algebra leads to the identity

$$f_\epsilon(E-\omega/2)f_\epsilon(E+\omega/2) = N_{\frac{\sigma_E}{\sqrt{2}}}(E-\mu_E)N_{\sqrt{2}\sigma_E}(\omega)\,. \tag{50}$$

Plugging (50) in (44) completes the proof. □

The function $S(\omega)$ describes the average magnitude of the off diagonal matrix-elements $|A_{ij}|^2$ at a distance $\omega = E_i - E_j$ from the diagonal. This is represented in Fig. X.

Result 4 and in particular Eq. (45) show that the density of relevant gaps $|g_\epsilon(\omega)|^2$ for local Hamiltonians and initial states with decaying correlations decomposes in the product of two densities: $S(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$ and $N_{\sqrt{2}\sigma_E}(\omega)$. The density $N_{\sqrt{2}\sigma_E}(\omega)$ is a Gaussian with standard deviation controlled by the energy fluctuations of the initial state σ_E, and $S(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$ is the density of the off diagonal elements of the observable A.

The dispersion of relevant gaps σ_G, which we expect to estimate the equilibration time, is then controlled by the smallest of the standard deviations of these two densities. In the case that the system is globally out of equilibrium, e. g., a global quench, the variance of the energy density of the initial state is extensive with the system size, and $\sigma_E \propto \sqrt{n}$. This implies the following statement:

Result 4 (Out of equilibrium observables in global quenches)**.** *Given a local Hamiltonian, an initial state with clustering of correlations and an observable A that can be described by a smooth function $S(E,\omega)$. Then, the only one way to avoid that the dispersion of relevant gaps σ_G associated to an observable A diverges in the macroscopic limit is that the matrix-representation of the observable A in the energy basis is banded. More specifically, the density $S(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$ has a standard deviation σ_A independent of the system size*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sigma_A = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\int_\epsilon^\infty d\omega\,(\omega-\mu_A)^2 S(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)}{\int_\epsilon^\infty d\omega\, S(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)} < \infty\,, \tag{51}$$

where μ_A is the first moment.

Note that a divergent dispersion of relevant gaps σ_G is expected to imply an equilibration time that tends to zero in the thermodynamic limit. In other words, observables which are not banded in its energy representation are expected to be always equilibrated, since the amount of time that the can be out of equilibrium is negligible.

It is worth to mention that generic observables have a flat $S(\omega)$ and fulfil $\sigma_A \propto \sqrt{n}$ due to the domination of the density of gaps $\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$. Thus, they will have microscopically short equilibration times [28]. Observables with the property (51) turn to be both rare and physically relevant.

In Ref. [29] it is shown for several concrete examples that indeed the matrix elements $S(\omega)$ decrease exponentially or super-exponentially with ω from a certain threshold independent of the system size. In the following result, we show that this is a property of any local observable, that is, operators that act non-trivially on a finite region of the system.

Result 5 (Local operators are banded in the energy basis)**.** *Let us consider a local Hamiltonian*

$$H = \sum_{(x,x')\in\mathcal{E}} h_{(x,x')} \tag{52}$$

acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{x\in V} \mathcal{H}_x$ *with* $\dim(\mathcal{H}_x) = d$ *where the locality structure is given by a graph with a vertex set* V *and edge set* $\mathcal{E}$*. Then, the matrix elements in the energy eigenbasis of a local operator* $\langle E_i|A_x|E_j\rangle$ *action on a site* x *fulfil the condition*

$$|\langle E_i|A_x|E_j\rangle| \leq \|A_x\|\, \mathrm{e}^{\log\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}(E_i-E_j)}{J(1+\alpha)}\right) - c(E_i-E_j)/J} \tag{53}$$

where $c = \log(1+\alpha^{-1})$ *is the decay rate,* $J = \max_{(x,x')\in\mathcal{E}} \|h\|_\infty$ *is the strength of the local interactions and* α *is the lattice animal constant of the graph* $(V,\mathcal{E})$*.*

The lattice animal constant is a parameter that captures the connectivity of the underlying graph of the Hamiltonian. For D*-dimensional cubic lattices, it can be bounded as* $\alpha \leq 2\,D\,\mathrm{e}$ *(Lemma 2 in Ref. [30]).*

In the period of finishing this manuscript we have been warned about the existence of a very similar result by Arad et al. (Theorem 2.1 in Ref. [31]). Both proofs are similar in spirit and give similar decay rates. For a D-dimensional cubic lattice with interactions in the edges, they obtain a decay rate of $1/(8D)$ while we get $\log(1+(2\,\mathrm{e}\,D)^{-1}) \simeq 1/(2\,\mathrm{e}\,D)$. The main difference is that while we bound the number of terms by counting lattice animals, they use a combinatoric argument. Our proof is presented in Appendix B.

Of course, this behaviour of being banded in the energy basis extends to global operators that can be decomposed in a sum of local terms, as well as for operators that are not local in real space but in momentum space when the Hamiltonian is also local in the momentum representation. Note that, indeed, most of observables considered in the literature are of this type.

Let us finally consider the relevant scenario of a *local quench*, in which the system is brought out of equilibrium in only a local region of the system. In such a case, the width of the energy density of the initial state is independent of the system size and related to the operator norm of the perturbation applied on the system. Unlike the global quench scenario, now all the observables that are initially out of equilibrium will take a finite non-negligible time to relax. The equilibration time scale is controlled by the smallest of the energy fluctuations and the σ_A of the observable.

6 Discussion

6.1 Reinterpretation of previous works under the dephasing mindset

From the dephasing mindset, it is useful now to try to interpret previous results on equilibration times. One of the most relevant recent papers is Ref. [11] which bounds the time average distance from equilibrium over a finite time. However, the bounds on the equilibration time obtained in [11]

scale exponentially with the system size when applied to a typical many-body system. Roughly speaking, the reason for such unphysical scaling is that the authors bound the whole sum (7) by bounding the absolute value of every term in it. Each term in the sum (11) individually gets dephased in a time scale $t \sim 1/(E_i - E_j)$. The bound in [11] hence corresponds to the amount of time needed for the slowest point to dephase.

Although the bound given in [11] is unphysical for most of many body systems in the sense that gives bounds on the equilibration time longer than the age of the universe, it is worth to mention that one can always construct an observable A which saturate them. In fact, in [32], such an observable is constructed by defining the operator A as a banded matrix in the energy basis with a bandwidth exponentially small in the system size. From the dephasing mindset, it is very easy to understand what is going on in this example. As the A is banded with a narrow bandwidht, the dispersion of relevant gaps is exponentially small, which implies an exponential large time till all the point are dephased and isotropically distributed in the complex plane. Analogously, in [32], it is also shown that one can always construct an observable which equilibrates extremely fast by defining an A which is far from banded. Again, the dephasing picture intuitively explains the reason of such equilibration.

6.2 Equilibration time-scales and level statistics

A consequence of the coarse-graining machinery introduced above is that the fine-grained details of the spectrum do not affect the dynamics of the system up to very long time scales. More formally, the following result states that if two coarse-grained frequency signals are close in the trace norm, then their corresponding time signals must also be point-wise close for any $t < O(\epsilon^{-1})$:

Result 6. *[Spectrum and dynamics] Let $g^{(1)}(t)$ and $g^{(2)}(t)$ be two time signals whose ϵ-coarse-grained Fourier transforms satisfy*

$$\left\| \tilde{g}_\epsilon^{(1)} - \tilde{g}_\epsilon^{(2)} \right\|_1 \leq \delta_1 \tag{54}$$

for some $\delta_1 > 0$, and let some $0 < \delta_2 < 2$ set a distinguishably threshold. Then $g^{(1)}(t)$ and $g^{(2)}(t)$ are indistinguishable up to times $t \leq \sqrt{\delta_2}/\epsilon$, in the sense that

$$|g^{(1)}(t) - g^{(2)}(t)| < \delta_1 + \delta_2, \tag{55}$$

Proof. By using twice the triangular inequality, we have

$$|g^{(1)}(t) - g^{(2)}(t)| \leq |g^{(1)}(t) - g_\epsilon^{(1)}(t)| + |g_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) - g_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)| + |g_\epsilon^{(2)}(t) - g^{(2)}(t)|\,. \tag{56}$$

The first and third terms are analogous and are bounded by Eq. (29) and the fact that $|g(t)| \leq 1$. Concerning the second term, we note that, since $\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) \in L^2$, then the uniform continuity statement of functional analysis allows us to write

$$\left\| g_\epsilon^{(1)} - g_\epsilon^{(2)} \right\|_\infty = \sup_t |g_\epsilon^{(1)}(t) - g_\epsilon^{(2)}(t)| \leq \left\| \tilde{g}_\epsilon^{(1)} - \tilde{g}_\epsilon^{(2)} \right\|_1 \leq \delta_1, \tag{57}$$

and putting everything together, we get

$$|g^{(1)}(t) - g^{(2)}(t)| \leq 2 \left| 1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 t^2} \right| + \delta_1. \tag{58}$$

Finally, the bound (55) is respected as long as $1/2\epsilon^2 t^2 \leq -\log(1-\delta_2/2)$. The inequality $x \leq -\ln(1-x)$ for $0 < x < 2$ implies that $1/2\epsilon^2 t^2 \leq \delta_2/2 \leq -\log(1-\delta_2/2)$. Thus, Eq. (55) is guaranteed to hold for times $t \leq \sqrt{\delta_2}/\epsilon$. □

Note that coarse-graining a frequency signal with an ϵ much larger than the gaps between consecutive energy levels $\epsilon \gg E_{i+1} - E_i$ washes out the fine-grained details of the spectrum and in particular its *level statistics*. The nearest neighbour spacing distribution of the energy levels is conjectured to be a manifestation of integrability when it follows a Poisson distribution and a signature of quantum chaos when is a Wigner-Dyson.

Result 6 shows that two frequency signals with different level statistics but that become very similar once they are ϵ-coarse-grained, have indistinguishable dynamics up to times ϵ^{-1}. This is particularly relevant in many-body systems where the separation between consecutive energy levels shrinks exponentially in the system size. This is a consequence of the fact that in many body systems the energy scales extensively (or even polynomially for some long range interactions) with the number of particles, while the dimension of the Hilbert space does it exponentially. Thus, coarse graining the frequency signal of a many body system with $\epsilon \sim 1/\mathrm{poly}(n)$ implies indistinguishability of the time signals up to $t \sim \mathrm{poly}(n)$, that is, for all realistic observable times. The drastically different behaviour of integrable and non-integrable models needs to be rooted in some other deeper feature, of which the level statistics is just a symptom.

To make more emphasis about this point, let us consider an integrable Hamiltonian H_0 with Poisson level statistics. We can add the weakest possible perturbation V which has the same eigenbasis as H_0 basis but changes the spectrum of $H_0 + V$ to have Wigner Dyson statistics. This can always be done with a perturbation $\|V\| \simeq \mathrm{gaps}(H_0)$. It is obvious from Result 6 that the dynamics would not be affected up to times $t \sim \|V\|^{-1} \sim \mathrm{gaps}(H_0)^{-1} \sim \exp(n)$. That is, two Hamiltonians with different level-statistics would have for any practical purpose the same dynamic behaviour.

A less artificial example comes from considering a perturbation V which does not commute with the integrable Hamiltonian H_0 and where both H_0 and V have a locality structure of the type (39). In such a scenario, the coarse-grained energy density of the initial state is not affected by the perturbation since it keeps the Hamiltonian local. Thus, any change in dynamical behaviour of the system must come from a drastic change in the matrix-elements of the observable. A question that arises beyond the scope of this paper is then, how integrability, non-integrability, and chaos can be identified in the behaviour of the matrix-elements of the observable in the energy basis.

6.3 The dephasing mindset for quadratic Hamiltonians

A relevant point to discuss is to which extent the results presented in this paper are valid for integrable models. In this respect, let us focus on quadratic (bosonic or fermionic) Hamiltonians that

can be brought to a a diagonal form $H = \sum_k \varepsilon(k) a_k^\dagger a_k$, where $a_k^{(\dagger)}$ are annihilation (creation) operators that fulfil some fermionic or bosonic commutation relations and $\varepsilon(k)$ is the dispersion relation. For such systems and quadratic observables, the time signal can also be written in the form of Eq. (7), where the sum now does not run over the gaps of the Hamiltonian, but over the gaps of the dispersion relation $\varepsilon(k)$. In Ref. [33] this is made in detail for the Caldeira-Leggett model (a quadratic system of harmonic oscillators).

In sum, we see that the above formalism can also be applied to quadratic Hamiltonians, where, roughly speaking, the Hilbert space has been substituted by the mode space.

7 Numerical example: the XYZ model

To ilustrate our results we will study the XXZ model in a transverse field and with next-neigbours since this model is not integrable and does not have an exponential number of degenerated gaps. The hamiltonian is $H = J \sum_i S_i^x S_{i+1}^x + S_i^y S_{i+1}^y + \Delta S_i^z S_{i+1}^z + J_2 S_i^z S_{i+2}^z + h_z S_i^z$. As the observable we will use magnetization density, $m^x = \sum_i S_i^x / N$, and as the initial state the full magnetized state in the x direction. In Fig. 4, we show the evolution of $|\Delta m^x(t)|^2$ for the the case with $\Delta = 0.5, J_2 = 1.0$ and $h_z = 0.2$ and for different system sizes. The calculations were done using full exact diagonalization. One can see that as N increases the size of the fluctuation decrease and we could say we have equilibration. We should also note that the equilibration time (the time when $|\Delta m^x(t)|^2$ becomes small) does not change much.



Figure 4: (Color online) Fluctuation in the total magnetization in the x direction, $|m^x(t)|^2$, for the XXZ model with next-neighoubrs coupling and external magnetic field ($\Delta = 0.5, J_2 = 1.0$ and $h_z = 0.2$). The differents curves are for sizes $N = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12$.

We also obtained the estimated for the equilibration time as $2\pi/\sigma_G$ and using eq. 15 to calculate σ_G. The results are showed in table 1. The estimated times are good agreement with the plots of Fig. 4. We also checked that the estimates as in good agremment with the plots for other values of Δ and h_z and for the XY model (in this case the infinity time fluctatuion does not decreases exponentially with N but polynomially since there are an exponential number of degenerated gaps).

N	T_{eq}
2	21
4	19
6	20
8	22
10	23
12	24

Table 1: Estimated equilibration times for the XXZ model with next-neighoubrs coupling and external magnetic field ($\Delta = 0.5$, $J_2 = 1.0$ and $h_z = 0.2$). T_{eq} was obtained using Eq. (15) for the gap variance.

8 Conclusions

In this work we have shown that equilibration in closed quantum systems needs to be understood as a process of dephasing of complex numbers in the complex plane. From this mechanism, we have heuristically estimated an equilibration times-cale as the inverse of the dispersion of the density of relevant gaps. We have seen that, under physically relevant circumstances, the equilibration time-scales estimated in this way does not depend on the system size in agreement with realistic situations. Although our argument does not result in a rigorous bound, we have found how the time-scale depends on the physical properties of the system. In particular, we have seen that the coherences of the observables of interest in the energy basis, $\langle E_i|A|E_j\rangle$, play a fundamental role: in order to attain a finite equilibration time, these coherences must become small as $E_i - E_j$ increases.

We have also observed that the size of the system only plays a role in the typical size of the fluctuations, but not in the time of equilibration, and thus small systems fail to equilibrate not because their equilibration time is large, but because their fluctuations are big We illustrate these results with numerical simulations of spins chains.

Finally, we have applied the dephasing mindset to give an intuitive interpretation to earlier works on equilibration times.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank J. Eisert and his co-authors in Ref. [13] for the coordination in the publication of this manuscript and their work. TRO and DJ are supported by the National Institute

for Science and Technology of Quantum Information (INCT-IQ). TRO also thanks the National Counsel of Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq). CC, ML and AR thank financial support from Spanish MINECO (QIBEQI FIS2016-80773-P, FISICATEAMO FIS2016-79508-P and Severo Ochoa Grant No. SEV-2015-0522), Fundació Privada Cellex, Generalitat de Catalunya (Grant No. SGR 874, 875, and CERCA Programme) and the European Commission [FP7-ICT-2011-7, Grant No. 288263; SIQS (FP7-ICT-2011-9 No. 600645); EU STREP QUIC (H2020-FETPROACT-2014 No. 641122); EQuaM (FP7/2007?2013 Grant No. 323714)], the HFSP (Grant No. RGP0027/2012), OSYRIS (ERC-2013-AdG Grant No. 339106)]. AR is also supported by the Beatriu de Pinós fellowship (BP-DGR 2013).

A Proof of Result 2: Coarse-grained frequency signal.

In this section we provide the proof of Result 2. The coarse grained Fourier transform of the time signal naturally decomposes

$$\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) = \sum_\alpha v(G_\alpha) h_\epsilon(\omega - G_\alpha) + \sum_\alpha \delta v_\alpha h_\epsilon(\omega - G_\alpha)\,. \tag{59}$$

The second term in the right hand side is a random variable with variance given by

$$\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)^2 := \text{var}\left(\sum_\alpha \delta v_\alpha h_\epsilon(\omega - G_\alpha)\right) = \sum_\alpha h_\epsilon^2(\omega - G_\alpha)\text{var}\left(\delta v_\alpha\right) = \sum_\alpha h_\epsilon^2(\omega - G_\alpha)\gamma^2(G_\alpha)$$

By means of the density of gaps, the variance of the fluctuation term in Eq. (59) becomes

$$\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)^2 = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\int \mathrm{d}\omega' N_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega - \omega')\rho(\omega')\gamma(\omega')\,, \tag{60}$$

where we have taken into account that $h_\epsilon(\omega)^2 = \sqrt{\pi}\epsilon^{-1}N_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega)$. Now we use the fact that $\gamma(\omega)$ is almost constant in an interval ϵ, i. e. the Lipshitz constant K of γ is such that $K\epsilon \ll 1$. The idea is to approximate $\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)^2$ by

$$\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)^2 \simeq \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\gamma^2(\omega)\int \mathrm{d}\omega' N_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega - \omega')\rho(\omega') = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\gamma^2(\omega)\rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega)\,, \tag{61}$$

More precisely, such approximation has 2 steps. The first step is to restrict the domain of integration around ω, where the Gaussian $N_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega - \omega')$ is centred. The error of such step can be upper bounded by

$$\left|\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)^2 - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\int_{\omega-\Delta}^{\omega+\Delta} \mathrm{d}\omega' N_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega - \omega')\rho(\omega')\gamma(\omega')\right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega)\alpha\,\mathrm{e}^{-2\Delta^2/\epsilon^2} \tag{62}$$

where we have used the Chernhoff bound of the Gaussian distribution $\int_x^\infty \mathrm{d}y N_\sigma(y) \leq 2\,\mathrm{e}^{-x^2/\sigma^2}$ and $\alpha > 0$ is a constant that depends on the density of gaps.

The second step is considering the worst case in the variation of $\gamma(\omega)$ within the interval of integration $[\omega-\Delta,\omega+\Delta]$. To do so, let us consider two real positive functions $a(x)$ and $b(x)$, where $b(x)$ has Lipschitz constant K. Then, by using trivial calculus and the definition of Lipschitz constant, we get

$$\int_{\omega-\Delta}^{\omega+\Delta} \mathrm{d}x a(x)b(x) \leq \left(\max_{x\in[\omega-\Delta,\omega+\Delta]} b(x)\right) \int_{\omega-\Delta}^{\omega+\Delta} \mathrm{d}x a(x) \leq (b(\omega)+K\Delta) \int_{\omega-\Delta}^{\omega+\Delta} \mathrm{d}x a(x)\,.$$

A straight forward application of the former statement leads to

$$\int_{\omega-\Delta}^{\omega+\Delta} \mathrm{d}\omega' \gamma^2(\omega') N_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega-\omega')\rho(\omega') - \gamma^2(\omega) \int_{\omega-\Delta}^{\omega+\Delta} \mathrm{d}\omega' N_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega-\omega')\rho(\omega') \leq \rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega) K\Delta\,.$$

By putting everything together, we get

$$\left|\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)^2 - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\gamma^2(\omega)\rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega)\right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega)\left(2\alpha\,\mathrm{e}^{-2\Delta^2/\epsilon^2} + K\Delta\right) \tag{63}$$

Finally, an optimization over Δ gives

$$\left|\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)^2 - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\epsilon}\gamma^2(\omega)\rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega)\right| \leq \alpha'\epsilon^{-1}\rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega) K\epsilon \tag{64}$$

where $\alpha'>0$ contains all the numerical factors. Equation (64) implies a relative error in the of the order $K\epsilon$.

The standard deviation $\delta v_\epsilon(\omega)$ sets the order of magnitude that the random variable. We will see that it is negligible in front of the first term in Eq. (59). Such a term can also be written in terms of the density of gaps $\rho(\omega)$

$$R_\epsilon(\omega) := \sum_\alpha v(G_\alpha) h_\epsilon(\omega-G_\alpha) = \int \mathrm{d}\omega' \rho(\omega') v(\omega') h_\epsilon(\omega-\omega') \tag{65}$$

The function $R_\epsilon(\omega)$ can be shown to be close to $\sqrt{2\pi}\; v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$. More precisely, by following an analogous argument that we did for, it can be proven that

$$\left|R_\epsilon(\omega) - \sqrt{2\pi}\; v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)\right| \leq \beta\rho_\epsilon(\omega) K\epsilon \tag{66}$$

where $\beta>0$ is an order one factor.

We are now ready to bound the difference $\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) - \sqrt{2\pi} v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$. By using the Eq. (59), definition (65) and the triangular inequality, we get

$$|\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) - 2\pi v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)| \leq \left|R_\epsilon(\omega) - \sqrt{2\pi} v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)\right| + \left|\sum_\alpha \delta v_\alpha h_\epsilon(\omega-G_\alpha)\right| \tag{67}$$

Finally, from Eqs. (61) and (66), the error is bounded by

$$|\tilde{g}_\epsilon(\omega) - 2\pi v(\omega)\rho_\epsilon(\omega)| \leq \rho_\epsilon(\omega)\left(\beta K\epsilon + \frac{\pi^{1/4}\gamma(\omega)}{\sqrt{\epsilon\rho_\epsilon(\omega)}}\right) . \tag{68}$$

Here, we have used that $\rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega) \leq \rho_{\epsilon/\sqrt{2}}(\omega)(1 + K\epsilon)$ where K also upper-bounds the Lipshitz constant of $\rho_\epsilon(\omega)$.

B Proof of Result 5: Local operators are banded in the energy basis

In this section we prove result 5. We first introduce the imaginary time evolution of the observable

$$A_x(\beta) := \mathrm{e}^{\beta H} A_x \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H} . \tag{69}$$

By Taylor expanding of the exponentials, it can be written as

$$A_x(\beta) = A_x + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^m}{m!}[H, \ldots [H, A_x] \ldots] , \tag{70}$$

where we have used that $[H, \ldots [H, A_x] \ldots] = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \binom{m}{k} H^k A_x (-H)^{m-k}$.

We use now the locality of the Hamiltonian given by its underlying graph $(V, \mathcal{E})$. In order to do so and for the sake of clarity, let us introduce some notation. We refer to edges $\lambda \in \mathcal{E}$ as *letters*, to the edge set $\mathcal{E}$ as an *alphabet*, and call the sequences of edges as *words*. For any *sub-alphabet* $F \subset \mathcal{E}$, we denote by F^l the set of words with letters in F and length l, where the length $|w|$ of a word w is the total number of letters it contains. In turn, the set of words with letters in F and arbitrary length l is defined as $F^* := \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} F^l$. The size of a sub-alphabet F is denoted by $|F|$ and corresponds to the number of letters it contains. We call a sub-alphabet F an animal if it forms a set of *connected* edges, and a word *connected* or *cluster* $c \in \mathcal{E}^*$ if the set of letters in c is an animal, i.e., connected. That is, clusters are connected sequences of edges where the edges can also occur multiple times, while animals are connected sub-grpaphs (sets of connected edges without order or repetition). For $w \in E^*$ and any sub-alphabet $G \subset \mathcal{E}$, we write $G \subset w$ if every letter in G also occurs in w. When a sub-alphabet F contains at least one edge adjacent to a vertex x, we denote it by $F \ni x$.

With the above notation, the order n commutator can be written as

$$[H, \ldots [H, A_x] \ldots] = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{E}^m} [h_{w_1}, \ldots [h_{w_m}, A_x] \ldots] \tag{71}$$

where w_k is the k-th letter of the word w and h_{w_k} the corresponding Hamiltonian term. Note that the only one way in order for the w-commutator $[h_{w_1}, \ldots [h_{w_n}, A_x] \ldots]$ to be different from zero is that w forms a single cluster with at least one of its letters adjacent to the vertex x. More formally,

$$[H, \ldots [H, A_x] \ldots] = \sum_{\substack{F \subset \mathcal{E}: \\ |F| \leq n \\ F \ni x}} \sum_{\substack{w \in F^n: \\ F \subset w}} [h_{w_1}, \ldots [h_{w_n}, A_x] \ldots] \tag{72}$$

where the first sum runs over all the animals F that contain at least an edge adjacent to the vertex x and are smaller or equal than n. Then, the imaginary time evolution of the observable can be written as

$$A_x(\beta) = A_x + \sum_{\substack{F\subset\mathcal{E}:\\ F\ni x}} \sum_{\substack{w\in F^*:\\ F\subset w}} \frac{\beta^{|w|}}{|w|!} [h_{w_1}, \dots [h_{w_{|w|}}, A_x] \dots] \,. \tag{73}$$

We can upper bound the operator norm of $A_x(\beta)$ as

$$\|A_x(\beta)\| \leq \|A_x\| \left(1 + \sum_{\substack{F\subset\mathcal{E}:\\ F\ni x}} \sum_{\substack{w\in F^*:\\ F\subset w}} \frac{(J\beta)^{|w|}}{|w|!} \right) \tag{74}$$

where we have used that for any operator O, $\|[h_{w_k}, O]\| \leq \|h_{w_k}\| \, \|O\|$, whose iteration implies $\left\| [h_{w_1}, \dots [h_{w_{|w|}}, A_x] \dots] \right\| \leq \|A_x\| \, J^{|w|}$. We recall now Lemma 5 from Ref. [34] which states that

$$\sum_{w\in F^*: F\subset w} \frac{|\beta J|^{|w|}}{|w|!} = (\mathrm{e}^{|\beta J|} - 1)^{|F|} \tag{75}$$

and implies

$$\|A_x(\beta)\| \leq \|A_x\| \left(1 + \sum_{\substack{F\subset\mathcal{E}:\\ F\ni x}} (\mathrm{e}^{|\beta J|} - 1)^{|F|} \right) . \tag{76}$$

By decomposing the sum over all animals which contain x according to their size, we get

$$\|A_x(\beta)\| \leq \|A_x\| \left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{F\subset\mathcal{E}:\\ |F|=l\\ F\ni x}} (\mathrm{e}^{\beta J} - 1)^{|F|} \right) , \tag{77}$$

The number of lattice animals of size l is upper-bounded by means of the so called *lattice animal constant* α. Given a graph $(V, \mathcal{E})$ and denoting by a_l the number of lattice animals of size l containing the fixed vertex x, then the *animal constant* α is the smallest constant satisfying

$$a_l := \sum_{\substack{F\subset\mathcal{E}:\\ |F|=l\\ F\ni x}} 1 \leq \alpha^l. \tag{78}$$

Regular lattices have finite animal constants[35]. For example, the animal constant of a D-dimensional cubic lattice can be bounded as $\alpha \leq 2\, D\, \mathrm{e}$ (Lemma 2 in Ref. [30]), where e is Euler's number.

Equation (78) allows us to bound (77) as

$$\|A_x(\beta)\| \leq \|A_x\| \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left(\alpha(\mathrm{e}^{\beta J} - 1)\right)^l , \tag{79}$$

which is a geometric series with common ratio $\alpha(\mathrm{e}^{2\beta J} - 1)$. In order for the series to converge we require that β is such that $\alpha(\mathrm{e}^{\beta J} - 1) < 1$, for which

$$\|A_x(\beta)\| \leq \|A_x\| \, \frac{1}{1 - \alpha(\mathrm{e}^{\beta J} - 1)} \, . \tag{80}$$

We compute the absolute value of the matrix-element $\langle E_i| \cdot |E_j\rangle$ in Eq. (69)

$$\mathrm{e}^{\beta(E_i - E_j)} \, |\langle E_i|A_x|E_j\rangle| = |\langle E_i|A_x(\beta)|E_j\rangle| \leq \|A_x(\beta)\| \, . \tag{81}$$

and, together with Eq. (80), it implies that

$$|\langle E_i|A_x|E_j\rangle| \leq \|A_x\| \, \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\beta J(E_i - E_j)/J}}{1 - \alpha(\mathrm{e}^{\beta J} - 1)} \tag{82}$$

for any β such that $\alpha(\mathrm{e}^{\beta J} - 1) < 1$.

In order to get an explicit bound independent of β, we optimize over β. Given some energy difference $E_i - E_j$, we look for the β that minimizes the upper bound of Eq. (82). To do so, it is useful to rewrite the bound in terms of a new parameter $z = \mathrm{e}^{\beta J}$ such that $|\langle E_i|A_x|E_j\rangle| \leq \|A_x\| \, f(z)$ with

$$f(z) := \frac{1}{\alpha(1 + \alpha^{-1} - z)z^{\omega}} \tag{83}$$

and $\omega = (E_i - E_j)/J$. By means of an optimization over z, we find the minimum at $z = \frac{\omega}{\omega+1}\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}$ which fulfils the convergence condition $1 < z < 1 + \alpha^{-1}$ as long as $\omega > \alpha$. The minimum value of $f(z_*)$ becomes

$$f(z_*) = \frac{\omega + 1}{\alpha + 1} \left(\frac{\omega}{\omega + 1}\right)^{-\omega} \left(1 + \alpha^{-1}\right)^{-\omega} \leq \frac{\omega + 1}{\alpha + 1} \, \mathrm{e} \left(1 + \alpha^{-1}\right)^{-\omega} \tag{84}$$

where the inequality comes from the fact that $(\omega/(\omega + 1))^{-\omega} \leq \mathrm{e}$. The matrix element $|\langle E_i|A_x|E_j\rangle|$ is then bounded by

$$|\langle E_i|A_x|E_j\rangle| \leq \|A_x\| \, \mathrm{e}^{\log\left(\frac{\mathrm{e}(E_i - E_j)}{J(1+\alpha)}\right) - c(E_i - E_j)/J} \tag{85}$$

where $c = \log(1 + \alpha^{-1})$ is the decay rate.

C Energy density and effective dimension of the initial state for local Hamiltonians

C.1 Energy uncertainty of the initial state

A standard way to bring quantum systems out of equilibrium is to initialize the system as the ground state of a local Hamiltonian, and sufficiently fast change the Hamiltonian of the system such that the state is kept unchanged. This procedure is called quantum quench.

It is well known that ground state of local Hamiltonians have clustering of correlations. In fact, the correlations decay algebraically with the distance for critical systems (gapless Hamiltonians) and exponentially for systems off criticality (gapped Hamiltonians).

Given a local Hamiltonian of the type (39) and a quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ with either exponentially or algebraically decaying correlations such that

$$|\langle h_u h_v\rangle - \langle h_u\rangle \langle h_v\rangle| \leq \frac{c}{d(u,v)^{D+1}}, \tag{86}$$

where $c > 0$, $d(u,v)$ is the graph distance between the edges u and v, and D is the spatial dimension in which the graph can be embedded. Then, the variance of the energy distribution is upper bounded by $\mathrm{var}_\psi(H_n) \leq c' n$ with $c' > 0$.

By using (86), it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{v\in E} \left(\langle h_u h_v\rangle - \langle h_u\rangle \langle h_v\rangle\right) \leq c' \qquad \forall\ u\,. \tag{87}$$

Hence, writing the variance in terms of the local terms of the Hamiltonian, and using the previous bound, one gets

$$\mathrm{var}_\psi(H_n) = \left\langle H^2\right\rangle_\psi - \langle H\rangle_\psi^2 = \sum_{u,v\in E} \left(\langle h_u h_v\rangle_\psi - \langle h_u\rangle_\psi \langle h_v\rangle_\psi\right) \leq cn\,, \tag{88}$$

If the system is brought out of equilibrium with a *global quench*, then the scaling of the variance is linear in the system size. Actually, it is even possible to show that *the energy density of a state with clustering of correlations becomes Gaussian for any short-ranged Hamiltonian in the limit of large sizes* (see Lemma 8 in Ref. [27]). Hence, the energy density after a global quench reads

$$f_\epsilon(E) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\Delta E}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{(E-\bar{E})^2}{2\Delta E^2}} \tag{89}$$

where $\bar{E} = \langle\psi(0)|H|\psi(0)\rangle$ and $\Delta E^2 = \langle\psi(0)|(H-\bar{E})^2|\psi(0)\rangle$ denote the average energy and the standard deviation.

Another possibility to bring the system out of equilibrium is to perform a local quench in the Hamiltonian or a local perturbation of the state. In this case the energy uncertainty of the initial state is independent of the system size and bounded by the energy range of the perturbation.

C.2 Effective dimension

The effective dimension tells us how many eigenstates of the Hamiltonian contribute in the superposition of the initial state. In the previous section we have argued that the energy uncertainty of the initial state scales with the $\sqrt{n}$ being n the system size in the case that the system is brought out of equilibrium with a global quench and independent of the system size in the case that it suffered a local quench.

Local Hamiltonians have an energy range that scales linearly in the system size while the dimension of the Hilbert space does it exponentially. This implies that the density of states scales exponentially, and so the effective dimension.

References

[1] C. Gogolin, J. Eisert. Equilibration, thermalisation, and the emergence of statistical mechanics in closed quantum systems *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 79, 056001 (2016).

[2] S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter. Entanglement and the foundations of statistical mechanics. *Nature Phys.*, 2:754–758, 2006.

[3] P. Reimann. Foundations of statistical mechanics under experimentally realistic conditions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 101:190403, 2008.

[4] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghì. Canonical typicality. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:050403, 2006

[5] N. Linden, S. Popescu, A. J. Short, and A. Winter. Quantum mechanical evolution towards thermal equilibrium. *Phys. Rev. E*, 79:061103, 2009.

[6] J. von Neumann Proof of the ergodic theorem and the H-theorem in quantum mechanics. *The European Physical Journal H*, 35:201, 2010

[7] Joel L. Lebowitz Boltzmann's Entropy and Time's Arrow. *Phys. Today*, 46, 9, 32 (1993).

[8] Anatoli Polkovnikov, Krishnendu Sengupta, Alessandro Silva, and Mukund Vengalattore. Colloquium: Nonequilibrium dynamics of closed interacting quantum systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 83, 863 (2011).

[9] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Thermalization and its mechanism for generic isolated quantum systems. Nature 452, 854 (2008).

[10] Luis Pedro García-Pintos, Noah Linden, Artur S.L. Malabarba, Anthony J. Short, Andreas Winter Equilibration time scales of physically relevant observables. *arXiv:1509.05732*

[11] A. J. Short and T. C. Farrelly. Quantum equilibration in finite time. *New J. Phys.*, 14:013063, 2012.

[12] M. Srednicki. Chaos and quantum thermalization. *Phys. Rev. E*, 50:888–901, 1994.

[13] H. Wilming, M. Goihl, C. Krumnow and J. Eisert. Towards local equilibration in closed interacting quantum many-body systems. 2017.

[14] A. J. Short. Equilibration of quantum systems and subsystems. *New J. Phys.*, 13:053009, 2011.

[15] Peter Reimann. Canonical thermalization. *New Journal of Physics*, 12(5):055027, 2010.

[16] L Fonda, G C Ghirardi, and A Rimini. Decay theory of unstable quantum systems. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 41(4):587, 1978.

[17] E. J. Torres-Herrera and Lea F. Santos. Nonexponential fidelity decay in isolated interacting quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 90, Sep 2014.

[18] R. W. Robinett Quantum wave packet revivals. *Physics Reports*, 392:1-119, 2004.

[19] J. H. Eberly, N. B. Narozhny, and J. J. Sanchez-Mondragon, Periodic Spontaneous Collapse and Revival in a Simple Quantum Model Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 1323, 1980.

[20] J. H. Eberly N. B. Narozhny, J. J. Sanchez-Mondragon. Coherence versus incoherence: Collapse and revival in a simple quantum model. *Phys. Rev. A*, 23:236, 1981.

[21] L. Allen and J. H. Eberly. Optical Resonance and Two-Level Atoms. Dover Publications, 1987.

[22] E.M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii. Statistical Physics: Theory of the Condensed State (Course of Theoretical Physics Vol. 9) Pergamon Press 1958.

[23] G. Baym and Christopher Pethick. Landau Fermi-Liquid Theory: Concepts and Applications Wiley-VCH, 2004.

[24] E. M. Stein and R. Shakarchi. Fourier Analysis: an Introduction. Princeton University Press, 2015.

[25] W. F. Eberlein. Abstract Ergodic Theorems and Weak Almost Periodic Functions. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 67, 1, 217-240, 1949.

[26] C. Corduneanu. Almost Periodic Oscillation and Waves. Springer, 2009.

[27] F. G. S. L. Brandão and M. Cramer. Equivalence of statistical mechanical ensembles for non-critical quantum systems. 2015.

[28] Sheldon Goldstein, Takashi Hara, and Hal Tasaki. On the time scales in the approach to equilibrium of macroscopic quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* , 111, 140401, 2013.

[29] M. Haque W. Beugeling, R. Moessner. Off-diagonal matrix elements of local operators in many-body quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. E*, 91:012144, 2015.

[30] Y. M. Miranda and G. Slade, The growth constants of lattice trees and lattice animals in high dimensions, Electron. Commun. Probab. 16, 129 (2011).

[31] I. Arad, T. Kuwahara and Z. Landau. Connecting global and local energy distributions in quantum spin models on a lattice. J. Stat. Mech. (2016) 033301.

[32] Sheldon Goldstein, Takashi Hara, and Hal Tasaki. Extremely quick thermalization in a macroscopic quantum system for a typical nonequilibrium subspace. *arXiv*, pages 1–5, 2014.

[33] M. Perarnau-Llobet, H. Wilming, A. Riera, R. Gallego and J. Eisert Fundamental corrections to work and power in the strong coupling regime. arXiv:1704.05864, 2017.

[34] M. Kliesch, C. Gogolin, M. J. Kastoryano, A. Riera, and J. Eisert. Locality of temperature. Phys. Rev. X 4, 031019 (2014).

[35] M. Penrose, Self-avoiding walks and trees in spread-out lattices, J. Stat. Phys. 77, 3 (1994).